

## **REMARKS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 11/18/2003.

The Examiner pointed out that applicant's arguments filed 9/8/2003 are not thought to be persuasive because the language "multi-resolution" is recited in the preamble, which is not incorporated into the body of the claim, the intended use recited in the preamble does not get patentable weight. In response to this, Claim 1 has been amended correctly, thus it is believed that the objection on this matter would be removed.

The Examiner pointed out that the Claims 1 and 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S Patent Steinle et al (5,646394), and Claims 2-7,14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinle et al in view of Suzuki.

However, applicant respectfully submits that the operation principle of the present invention is significantly different from that of the cited arts, which is to be explicitly explained as follows:

According to Steinle et al that only a component of the whole optical system needs to be moved (such as reflection mirror, lens, photosesor or even wedge lens) when in order to align the photosensor arrays with the center of the photo sensor. However, based on the working principle of the present invention which is expressed by the equitation:  $1/p + 1/q = 1/f$ , that if any parameter is changed, then at least one of the other two parameters will be changed too. Such as the "P" is

increased, the "q" will be diminished on condition that the "f" is not changed, that is to say that at least two components (namely parameters: such as the object distance "p" and the image distance "q") of the optical device in accordance with the present invention should be changed and then revolution can be adjusted. It is believed that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) and 35 U.S.C 103(a) should be removed and the Claims 1, 8-13, 2-7,14 and 15 should be allowable.

Courtesy, cooperation and skill of Examiner Euncha P. CHERRY are appreciated and acknowledged.

Respectfully,

By: 

Charles E. Baxley  
Attorney of Record  
USPTO REG. 20,149  
90 JOHN STREET, 3<sup>RD</sup> FLOOR  
New York, New York 10038  
Telephone 212-791-7200  
Facsimile 212-791-7276  
E-mail ceb@hartbaxley.com